<u>REMARKS</u>

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed from the Patent and Trademark Office on April 5, 2005. A petition to revive the present application is submitted in a petition filed herewith.

Claims 1-7 and 17-20 are pending in the above-identified application, and all of these claims stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Experton (USP 5,995,965).

In the current paper, Claims 1, 17 and 18 are amended. No new matter is entered. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

<u>Rejections under 35 USC 102</u>

Claims 1-17 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Experton (USP 5,995,965).

In his Response to Arguments (Office Action, page 6), the Examiner writes:

In the remarks, the applicant argues in substance that; A) Experton does not disclose receiving an authorization code with the user terminal, the authorization code being transmitted by the server in response to the authorized user information.

In response to A) Experton teaches a system and method for user authorization to retrieve requested data from a remote web page using a smart card (see abstract). The user receives updated user information and stores the data to the terminal and to the smart card (see col. 11 lines 7-50). There is no limitation in the claim on the content of the identification code and therefore the data transmitted from the server to the terminal and to the smart card meets the scope of the claimed limitation "the authorization code being transmitted by the server in response to the authorized user information".

Claim 1 is amended herein in response to the argument raised by the examiner to recite (in pertinent part):

> ...using the authorization code to retrieve a target Internet address from the smart card, <u>wherein the target Internet address is stored on the smart card such that the user terminal is prevented from retrieving the target Internet address without receiving the authorization code from the server, and</u> wherein the target Internet address corresponds with the target Internet site...

Similarly, Claim 17 is amended to recite (in pertinent part):

> ...means for retrieving a target Internet address corresponding with the target Internet site from the smart card in response to the authorization code<u>, wherein the target Internet address is stored on the smart card such that said means is prevented from retrieving the target Internet address without first receiving the authorization code from the server</u>...

And Claim 18 is similarly amended to recite (in pertinent part):

> ...a smart card for insertion into the user terminals, the smart card being programmed to store authorized user information for one of the authorized users and a target Internet address associated with a target Internet site<u>, wherein the target Internet address is stored on the smart card such that the user terminals are prevented from retrieving the target Internet address without first receiving authorization from the server</u>...

Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 17 and 18 is

provided in Applicant's paragraph 0022 (specification page 6, emphasis added):

> **[0022]** When the owner of user terminal 130 inserts smart card 232 into smart card slot 215 of set-top box 131, an initialization process is started. During this process, set-top box 131 retrieves the authorized user information stored on smart card 232, and transmits this information to system server 110. If system server 110 determines that the user authorization information is valid, then system server 110 transmits an authorization code to set-top box 131. In response to the authorization code, set-top box 131 retrieves the target URL stored on smart card 232. **(Set-top box 131 is not able to retrieve the target URL without the authorization code.)** Set-top box uses the retrieved target URL to access the target Internet site. In response, target Internet site 120 transmits the target information (i.e., a web page) to set-top box 131. Set-top box 131, in turn, displays the downloaded target information on video display 132. In this manner, the target information is automatically provided to user terminal 130 without the user having to know or enter the target URL associated with the target Internet site.

As amended Claims 1, 17 and 18 are believed to fully address the argument raised by the Examiner (copied above) by clarifying the content and use of the authorization code. Accordingly, Claims 1, 17 and 18 are believed to be distinguished over Experton and in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-7 are dependent from Claim 1, and are distinguished over Experton for at least the reasons provided above with reference to Claim 1.

Claims 19 and 20 are dependent from Claim 18, and are distinguished over Experton for at least the reasons provided above with reference to Claim 18.

For the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC 102.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-7 and 17-20 are pending in the present Application. Reconsideration and allowance Claims 1-7 and 17-20 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No.: 022888

Patrick T. Bever
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 33,834
408-451-5902

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on December 30, 2005.

12/30/2005
Date

Signature: Rebecca A. Baumann